

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

Global Traffic Technologies,

Plaintiff,

v.

KM Enterprises, Inc., Rodney K.
Morgan, and STC, Inc.,

Defendants.

SPECIAL VERDICT FORM
Civil No. 10-4110 ADM/JJG

SPECIAL VERDICT FORM

We, the jury in the above-entitled action, make these answers to the following questions:

I. INFRINGEMENT

- A. Has GTT proven by a greater weight of the evidence that **KM Enterprises, Inc.** has directly or indirectly infringed any of the Asserted Claims of the '398 patent? (A "YES" answer to this question is a finding for GTT. A "NO" answer is a finding for Defendants.)

Claim 1: Yes ☒ No ☐

Claim 3: Yes ☒ No ☐

Claim 8: Yes ☒ No ☐

Claim 10: Yes ☒ No ☐

Claim 16: Yes ☒ No ☐

Claim 17: Yes ☒ No ☐



- B. Has GTT proven by a greater weight of the evidence that **Rodney “Kris” Morgan** has directly or indirectly infringed any of the Asserted Claims of the '398 patent? (A “YES” answer to this question is a finding for GTT. A “NO” answer is a finding for Defendants.)

Claim 1: Yes ☒ No ☐

Claim 3: Yes ☒ No ☐

Claim 8: Yes ☒ No ☐

Claim 10: Yes ☒ No ☐

Claim 16: Yes ☒ No ☐

Claim 17: Yes ☒ No ☐

- C. Has GTT proven by a greater weight of the evidence that **STC, Inc.** has directly or indirectly infringed any of the Asserted Claims of the '398 patent? (A “YES” answer to this question is a finding for GTT. A “NO” answer is a finding for Defendants.)

Claim 1: Yes ☒ No ☐

Claim 3: Yes ☒ No ☐

Claim 8: Yes ☒ No ☐

Claim 10: Yes ☒ No ☐

Claim 16: Yes ☒ No ☐

Claim 17: Yes ☒ No ☐

Please continue to Section II.

II. VALIDITY

- A. Have Defendants proven by clear and convincing evidence that any of the Asserted Claims of the '398 patent are "obvious"? (A "YES" answer to this question is a finding for Defendants. A "NO" answer is a finding for GTT.)

Claim 1: Yes ___ No ☒

Claim 3: Yes ___ No ☒

Claim 8: Yes ___ No ☒

Claim 10: Yes ___ No ☒

Claim 16: Yes ___ No ☒

Claim 17: Yes ___ No ☒

- B. Have Defendants proven by clear and convincing evidence that any of the Asserted Claims of the '398 patent are "anticipated"? (A "YES" answer to this question is a finding for Defendants. A "NO" answer is a finding for GTT.)

Claim 1: Yes ___ No ☒

Claim 3: Yes ___ No ☒

Claim 8: Yes ___ No ☒

Claim 10: Yes ___ No ☒

Claim 16: Yes ___ No ☒

Claim 17: Yes ___ No ☒

If you have found that any claim is both infringed (by answering "Yes" to any of the questions in Section I) and that the same claim is not invalid (by answering "No" to the question relating to that claim in Section II), then please complete Section III.

III. DAMAGES

If you have found one or more claims of the '398 Patent to be infringed by one or more of the Defendants and that claim is not invalid, what damages do you find GTT has proven by a greater weight of the evidence (i.e., more probable than not) that it is entitled to recover because of Defendants' sale of infringing products?

\$ 5,052,118

If you have found that any claim is both infringed (by answering "Yes" to any of the questions in Section I) and that the same claim is not invalid (by answering "No" to the question relating to that claim in Section II), then please complete Section IV.

IV. WILLFULNESS

Has GTT proven by clear and convincing evidence that any of the Defendants willfully infringed any of the Asserted Claims of the '398 patent? (A "YES" answer to this question is a finding for GTT. A "NO" answer is a finding for the individual Defendant.)

KM Enterprises, Inc.: Yes ☒ No ☐

Rodney "Kris" Morgan: Yes ☒ No ☐

STC, Inc.: Yes ☒ No ☐

Dated: Sept. 20, 2013